| | Declassified in Part - | - Sanitized Copy | Approved for Release | e 2013/03/04 : | CIA-RDP61S00750 | A000500050003-7 |
|--|------------------------|------------------|----------------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|--|------------------------|------------------|----------------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|

| TOP | SECRET |
|-----|--------|
| | |

| | | 50X′ |
|--------|------|------|
| 20py 2 | of 2 | 2_ |

12 March 1957

MEMORANDUM FOR: Project Director

SUBJECT:

Conclusions of Consultant Panel

- 1. In response to your request, I am summarizing below the major conclusions reached by the Consultant Panel, convened on 7 March for the purpose of determining the intended use of the installation near Mozhaysk. These conclusions were not reached formally and were not agreed to unanimously but, rather, represent the major areas of agreement reached by the panel in their discussion. (The composition of the panel is shown on page 3.)
 - a. The panel concluded that it is possible that the site might be a launching site for an IRBM. However, this concedes that the Soviets were willing to freeze the design of their operational bases and general missile configuration as much as two years ago a time which was well ahead of the IRBM program as estimated in the intelligence community.
 - b. The panel concluded that it is very unlikely that the site was designed as an operational launching site for an ICBM. The panel pointed out that the size of an ICBM did not lend itself to easy handling in the interior of the cone. The panel was reluctant also to grant the Soviets were far enough along with their ICBM program, as of the time of the construction of this site, to freeze missile configuration and base design.

| | c. | Altho | ugh t | he pai | nel die | 1 not | seriou | isly c | onside | r it, |
|-------|-------|--------|-------|--------|---------|-------|---------|--------|--------|-------------|
| they | did | grant | that | , pro | vided (| other | simila | r sit | es wer | e found |
| | | | | | | | ibility | | | |
| could | l be | used | for s | urfec | e-to-a | ir mi | ssiles | to be | used | against |
| U. S. | . bor | nbers. | | | | | | | | |

TOP SECRET

HANDLE VIA TALENT CONTROL SYSTEM ONLY 50X1

| | TOP SECRET Copy 2 of 22 |
|---|---|
| | SUBJECT: Conclusions of Consultant Panel |
| • | f. The panel concluded that the site might be used for prototype power reactors such as those announced in their Sixth Five Year Plan. However, the "hardness" of the site against attack could not be explained on the basis of use as a site for prototype power reactors. Also, the facilities appeared to lack the flexibility and space we would design into a developmental site. |
| | |
| | 2. A more comprehensive report on the panel meeting is being prepared and I will forward a copy of this report to you on its completion. |
| | HERBERT SCOVILLE, JR. / Assistant Director |

HANDLE VIA TALENT CONTROL SYSTEM ONLY Declassified in Part - Sanitized Copy Approved for Release 2013/03/04: CIA-RDP61S00750A000500050003-7

TOP SECRET

Copy 2 of 22

CONSULTANTS PANEL

50X1

Dr. Willard K. Davis

Prof. Clark B. Millikan

Dr. Mark M. Mills

Prof. Wm. H. Pickering

Dr. Simon Ramo

Dr. Raemer E. Schreiber

Prof. Horton G. Stever

Mr. Hood Worthington

Director, Reactor Development Division, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission

California Institute of Technology

Livermore Laboratory, University of

California

Jet Propulsion Laboratory, California

Institute of Technology

Ramo-Wooldridge Corporation

Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory

Massachusetts Institute of Technology

E. I. DuPont de Nemours & Company.